UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,709	10/02/2003	Gregg S. Schmidtk	200300049-1	9168
	7590 04/29/200 CKARD COMPANY	9	EXAMINER	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION			PUROL, SARAH L	
	AL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION NS, CO 80527-2400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3637	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM ipa.mail@hp.com jessica.l.fusek@hp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/677,709	SCHMIDTK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sarah Purol	3637
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron e, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 J	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed as a composition and accomposition and accomposition is objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct should be contacted as a composition of the correct should be contacted as a composition of the correct should be contacted as a composition of the correct should be contacted as a contact shou	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat Prity documents have been receiv Bu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal C 6) Other:	oate

Prosecution on the merits is hereby re-opened.

Claims 5 and 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. There is no antecedent basis for "posts" as recited in line 2 of both claims 5 and 6. Regarding claim 11, the structure of the ramp engaging the frame is not enough to accomplish the retraction of the hanger. There is not enough structural explanation (means recited) to accomplish retraction (the function desired).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,4 ,7,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Greenberg et al. 5993099.

Greenberg et al. teach an apparatus (capable of mounting an electronic device to a rack system -the electronic device is not claimed and therefore could be something as simple as a musical greeting card or a circuit card for a computer or a compact disc–kept within a file). The frame assembly includes two rails 60 and a plurality of retractable hangers 42-48 on opposite sides of the device 10. The hangers are retractable to fit the device into the frame engaging the two rails 60. The retractable hangers are shown extended in Figure 4 and retracted in Figure 5. The device is

slidable on the plurality of hangers on at least a portion of at least two rails. Hangers 42,46 are opposite hangers 44,48 on opposite sides of device. The ramp portion of the hangers are best seen in Figure 4. Note hanger portions 58 and the ramp portion that engages the inner side of rails 60.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fall et al. 6209979. Note electronic device12, fitting within two rails 24with channel 60, hangers 14, biasing release element 66.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 5 and 6 (as best understood), 8 and 9,11,12,13 (as best understood from the claim language) rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg et al. in view of Fitzburgh 5967337. Fitzburgh teaches a frame having posts 18-21 for supporting rails 15,16,17 which in turn support hangers 60 which support

Art Unit: 3637

electronic devices. To provide either Fitzburg with retractable hangers as taught by Greenberg et al. for the purpose of fitting differing sized devices or to support the devices and hangers of Greenberg on a frame with posts as taught by Fitzburg would have in either case been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Regarding the shape of the hangers, whether they are cylindrical or triangular or any other shape in cross section is considered to be a matter of choice. The Greenberg et al. device is rectangular in cross section; however, another shape is not seen to make any difference nor yield any unexpected or unobvious result and is considered largely a matter of choice in design. Note that Greenberg et al. shows a stop (element 76 engaging element 74). Note also that Fitzburg teaches a stop in the form of the intersection between elements 12 and 13 and elements 15.16.17.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon at this time is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and cited on the attached Notice of References Cited for applicant's consideration.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah Purol whose telephone number is 571-272-6834. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday -Friday during normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai, can be reached on 571-272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/677,709 Page 5

Art Unit: 3637

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sarah Purol/

Primary Examiner

AU 3637